

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/942,137

Applicant(s)

ANGELUCCI ET AL.

Examiner

Annette R. Reimers

Art Unit

3732

## All Participants:

(1) Annette R. Reimers.

(2) Garry Tuma reg. # 40,210.

## Status of Application: Non-final

(3) Eduardo Robert.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 9/26 & 9/30 2005

Time: Afternoon

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-8, 13-21, 23-25, 27 and 53-68

Prior art documents discussed:

Yonenobu (JPO2000175943)

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
EDUARDO C. ROBERT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Mr. Tuma, applicants' representative, on Monday, September 26, 2005, to discuss the claims. Examiner explained to Mr. Tuma that claims 23-25, 27 and 53-68 were in condition for allowance and that, in her opinion, the Yonenobu prior art reference still read on claims 1-8, 13-14 and 16-21. Examiner reminded Mr. Tuma that claim 15 was objected to but would be allowable if placed in independent form. Mr. Tuma told examiner that he would have to discuss possible amendments to claims 1-21 with his clients and that he would get back to examiner by Friday, September 30, 2005. Examiner and Mr. Tuma spoke again on Friday. Mr. Tuma suggested removing the word "substantially" from claim 1, line 13, so that the claim would read "having the same contour" instead of "having substantially the same contour". Examiner explained that, in her opinion, the Yonenobu reference would still read on claims 1-8, 13-14 and 16-21. Examiner further stated that she would discuss the change to claim 1 with her supervisor and that further search and/or consideration may be required. Examiner and Mr. Tuma agreed that if examiner and her supervisor felt that the Yonenobu reference or any other reference read on claim 1, i.e. without the word "substantially" being included, that examiner should send an office action and that examiner should consider claim 1 in its currently amended form, i.e. "having substantially the same contour".